

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has essentially adopted the Examiner's suggested revisions to address these rejections. Reconsideration, particularly in conjunction with the amendments to claim 1, is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Neubrand et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,318,792). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the description of the movement of translation which is documented and explained in the specification as filed on page 3, lines 27-32, for example. Applicant respectfully submits that Neubrand et al. '792 neither discloses or suggests a vehicle back shelf according to claim 1 as amended. In particular, there is no teaching or motivation for a vehicle back shelf having a central

plate and two lateral plates that are slidable in translation relative to the central plate. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

New claim 9 is essentially a combination of the subject matter of claims 1 and 8 as previously presented, taking into account the translation of the two side plates relative to the central plate. As this concept is not disclosed or contemplated under Neubrand, allowance is requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 29, 2005

By: Robert M. Siminski
Robert M. Siminski
Reg. No. 36,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RMS/jao